

SUPER LAW GROUP, LLC

May 11, 2016

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Pine Nonferrous, Inc.
34-40 Laurel Hill Blvd.
Maspeth, New York 11378

Pine Export, Inc.
34-40 Laurel Hill Blvd.
Maspeth, New York 11378

Pine Scrap Metal, Inc.
34-40 Laurel Hill Blvd.
Maspeth, New York 11378

Landstar, Inc.
34-40 Laurel Hill Blvd.
Maspeth, New York 11378

Wah Hom
34-40 Laurel Hill Blvd.
Maspeth, New York 11378

Re: Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit under the Clean Water Act

Dear All:

We are writing on behalf of Riverkeeper, Inc.¹ ("Riverkeeper") to notify you of Riverkeeper's intent to file suit against Pine Nonferrous, Inc., Pine Export, Inc., Pine Scrap Metal, Inc., Landstar, Inc., and Wah Hom (together, "Pine") pursuant to Section 505(a) of the federal Clean Water Act ("CWA")² for violations of the CWA.

Riverkeeper intends to file suit, as an organization and on behalf of its adversely affected members, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York seeking

¹ Riverkeeper, Inc. is a not-for-profit environmental organization existing under the laws of the state of New York, headquartered in Ossining, New York. Riverkeeper's mission includes safeguarding the environmental, recreational and commercial integrity of the Hudson River and its ecosystem, as well as the watersheds that provide New York City with its drinking water. Riverkeeper achieves its mission through public education, advocacy for sound public policies and participation in legal and administrative forums. Riverkeeper has more than 4,500 members, many of whom reside near to, use and enjoy the Hudson River and the waters and tributaries of New York Harbor, including Newtown Creek, Coney Island Creek, Jamaica Bay, and the Gowanus Canal; waters that are polluted by industrial stormwater runoff.

² 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a). We refer to statutory provisions by their section in the Clean Water Act and provide the parallel citation to the United States Code only on first reference.

appropriate equitable relief, civil penalties, and other relief no earlier than 60 days from the postmark date of this letter.³

Riverkeeper intends to take legal action because Pine is discharging polluted stormwater, as detailed herein, from its scrap and waste material facility located near Newtown Creek in Brooklyn ("the Facility") to the waters of the United States without a permit. This is a violation of Sections 301(a) and 402(p)(2)(B) of the Clean Water Act.⁴ Further, Pine has not applied for coverage under, nor complied with the conditions of, an individual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit or the General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activity ("General Permit")⁵ issued by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("DEC"), in violation of Sections 402(p), and 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.26(c)(1) and (e)(1).

The street address of the Facility is provided in government records as 34-40 Laurel Hill Blvd., Queens, New York. For clarity, the Facility location can be uniquely identified by tax block and lot numbers as block 2520 lot 22, in Queens County. The waters of the United States that are polluted by the Facility include Newtown Creek and the East River.

I.

BACKGROUND

With every rainfall event, hundreds of millions of gallons of polluted rainwater pour into New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, and other receiving waters. The consensus among agencies and water quality specialists is that stormwater pollution accounts for more than half of the total pollution entering the marine environment each year.⁶

DEC has designated more than 7,000 river miles, 319,000 acres of larger waterbodies, 940 square miles of bays and estuaries, and 592 miles of Great Lakes shoreline in the State as "impaired," or not meeting water quality standards, and unable to support beneficial uses such as fish habitat and water contact recreation.⁷ For the overwhelming majority of water bodies listed as impaired, stormwater runoff is cited as a primary source of the pollutants causing the

³ See 40 C.F.R. § 135.2(a)(3)(c) (notice of intent to file suit is deemed to have been served on the postmark date).

⁴ 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a) and 1342(p)(2)(B).

⁵ New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, *SPDES Multi-Sector General Permit For Stormwater Discharges Associated With Industrial Activity*, Permit No. GP-0-12-001, (hereinafter "General Permit"), available at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/9009.html>. This General Permit replaces earlier general permits for the discharge of stormwater associated with industrial activity. It became effective on October 1, 2012, and will expire on September 30, 2017.

⁶ Stormwater is water from precipitation events that flows across the ground and pavement after it rains or after snow and ice melt. See 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(13).

⁷ See EPA, Watershed Assessment, Tracking and Environmental Results, New York Assessment Data for 2012, http://ofimpub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_state.report_control?p_state=NY&p_cycle=2012&p_report_type=A (last visited Aug. 4, 2015).

impairment. Contaminated stormwater discharges can and must be controlled in order to improve the quality and health of these waterbodies.

Stormwater discharges flow from the Facility through a separate sewer system into Newtown Creek and ultimately into the East River and New York Harbor. DEC has classified Newtown Creek as an SD water.⁸ Under New York's Water Quality Standards, a waterbody that is designated as SD is meant to be suitable for fishing and for fish, shellfish and wildlife survival.⁹ The New York Water Quality Standards also set numeric and narrative criteria for different water pollution parameters including dissolved oxygen, oil and grease, suspended and settleable solids, bacteria (pathogens), pH, temperature, nutrients, and others. A waterbody must meet these numeric and narrative criteria in order to support its designated uses.¹⁰

Newtown Creek, which is also a federally-listed Superfund site, consistently fails to meet state water quality standards; illegal stormwater discharges from this Facility contribute to this failure.¹¹ In the past, DEC has designated Newtown Creek as impaired pursuant to Section 303(d) of the CWA¹² for failure to meet minimum water quality standards due to high oxygen demand (low levels of dissolved oxygen) and the presence of floatables (oil, grease, and other debris) attributable in part to urban stormwater runoff.¹³ While the Creek has been removed from the list of waterbodies for which a Total Maximum Daily Load ("TMDL") must be developed, the degraded water quality conditions that led to the impaired listing have not been addressed;¹⁴ polluted discharges to Newtown Creek continue to reduce the dissolved oxygen level in the Creek.¹⁵ Illegal stormwater discharges from this Facility carry oxygen demanding chemicals into Newtown Creek and therefore contribute directly to this problem.

For years, Newtown Creek was treated as an industrial dumping ground; businesses along its banks polluted with abandon. In recent decades, New York City has worked to reclaim the quality of New York Harbor and of Newtown Creek. The City and local residents have invested heavily in efforts to rejuvenate the Creek and surrounding neighborhoods. Recently, the U.S. EPA joined the effort by designating Newtown Creek as a Superfund site, setting aside funds for a cleanup, and mobilizing public and private efforts to restore the Creek to a healthier state.¹⁶ It is time for Pine to join fully in this broader effort to restore the biological integrity of Newtown

⁸ See 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 890.6.

⁹ See 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.14.

¹⁰ See 6 N.Y.C.R.R. §§ 702, 703.

¹¹ See NY DEC, *Impaired/Delisted Waters NOT Included on the 2014 Section 303(d) List Sept. 2014*, available at http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/water_pdf/303dlistfinal2014.pdf (hereinafter "303(d) List").

¹² 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d).

¹³ See 303(d) List.

¹⁴ Newtown Creek is not included on the section 303(d) list, but is included on a list of other impaired waters for which no Total Maximum Daily Load ("TMDL") will be prepared. A TMDL is not necessary because other required control measures are expected to result in restoration in a reasonable period of time. Specifically, Newtown Creek pollution is being addressed through the CSO Consent Order to meet pathogen standards. See NYS Dep't of Env'tl. Conservation, *Impaired/Delisted Waters NOT Included on the 2014 Section 303(d) List*, http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/water_pdf/303dnotlisted2014.pdf

¹⁵ See *Id.*

¹⁶ See 40 C.F.R. Part 300, App. B.

Creek. At a minimum, Pine must stop illegally discharging polluted stormwater and other effluents.

II.

STANDARDS AND LIMITATIONS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN VIOLATED AND ACTIVITIES ALLEGED TO BE VIOLATIONS

A. Pine is Discharging Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activity to Waters of the United States without a Permit.

The CWA prohibits the discharge of pollutants to the waters of the United States except in accordance with a valid NPDES permit.¹⁷ Pine's industrial activity at the Facility has caused and continues to cause a "discharge of pollutants" within the meaning of Section 502(12) of the CWA¹⁸ and a "stormwater discharge associated with industrial activity" within the meaning of 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(b)(14) from the Facility on at least each and every day that there has been a rain event of more than 0.1 inches.¹⁹ The Facility has exposed and continues to expose industrial pollutants to stormwater by, at a minimum, (a) receiving, processing, and transporting solid waste as well as scrap and recyclables outside or otherwise exposing them to the elements, and (b) from vehicles entering and leaving the Facility that track pollutants off site. During precipitation events (including runoff from rainfall and snow or ice melt events), pollutants are carried away from the Facility in stormwater discharges into Newtown Creek.

Pine's activities at the Facility include but are not limited purchase, collection, processing, storage, reshipment and resale of scrap metal and other recyclable wastes, as well as operating a waste transfer station that is open to the public. These activities include operation and storage of industrial equipment, and much of this activity is conducted outdoors. In carrying out these activities at the Facility, Pine engages in storing and handling materials in a manner that exposes pollutants to precipitation and snowmelt. The stormwater discharged into Newtown Creek can bring solids that suspend or dissolve in stormwater, metals such as zinc, copper, lead, cadmium, chromium, and arsenic; hydraulic fluids, PCBs, mercury, and other pollutants into the Creek.²⁰

Riverkeeper has observed and documented evidence of the release of polluted stormwater at the Facility. The entire Facility is paved, which facilitates runoff from the site. Stormwater from the

¹⁷ See CWA §§ 301(a) and 402.

¹⁸ 33 U.S.C. § 1362(12).

¹⁹ EPA has determined that precipitation greater than 0.1 inches in a 24-hour period constitutes a measurable precipitation event for the purposes of evaluating stormwater runoff associated with industrial activity. See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(c)(i)(E)(6) (using 0.1 inches as the distinguishing threshold of a storm event).

²⁰ See EPA, "Industrial Stormwater Fact Sheet Series, Sector N: Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities," available at http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/npdes/stormwater/upload/sector_n_scraprecycling.pdf.

Facility enters a storm drain near the intersection of Laurel Hill Boulevard and 56th Road. The stormwater that runs off the Facility contains debris, suspended solids, and other pollutants.

Trucks and other vehicles driving on and off the property are also point sources of pollution. The Facility uses heavy vehicles and stationary machinery outdoors. Besides the wastes they carry, vehicles and industrial equipment at the Facility may expose many other pollutants to the elements, including gasoline, diesel fuel, anti-freeze, and hydraulic fluids.

All of these pollution sources are exposed to precipitation and snowmelt. In addition to waste residues, these pollution sources also may release fuel, oil, lubricants, PCBs, PAHs, an array of metals, pH-affecting substances and chemical residues. These toxic pollutants are often generated in the form of small particulate matter, which settles on the ground and other surfaces that are exposed to stormwater and non-stormwater flows.

Because Pine fails to adequately shelter and otherwise contain these materials to prevent their release to the environment, precipitation falls on and flows over exposed materials, fluids, and particulates. Polluted stormwater discharges flow from the Facility to a storm drain at the corner of near the intersection of Laurel Hill Boulevard and 56th Street Road. The storm drain is part of a separate sewer system and discharges directly into Newtown Creek. Further, vehicles at the Facility track particulate matter, and other contaminants, to areas on and off the premises from which these pollutants can enter stormwater and, ultimately, the New York Harbor.

Newtown Creek is a "water[] of the United States," as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 122.2 and a "navigable waters" as defined in Section 502(7) of the CWA. Pine does not have a NPDES permit for these discharges of pollutants. Thus, Pine is discharging polluted industrial stormwater into navigable waters of the United States without the permit required under Sections 301 and 402 of the CWA.

B. Pine is Violating the Clean Water Act by Failing to Apply for NPDES Permit Coverage.

Pine accepts, breaks up, sorts, and distributes scrap, waste, and recyclable materials. Accordingly, Pine is an industrial discharger engaged in scrap recycling under Standard Industrial Classification ("SIC") Code 5093, which is an industrial activity included in Sector N of the General Permit.

To be eligible to discharge under the General Permit, Pine must submit to DEC a registration form called a "Notice of Intent."²¹ Notice of Intent forms are available online from DEC

²¹ See General Permit, Part I.E.3. In notifying Pine that the Clean Water Act requires coverage under and compliance with a valid NPDES permit in order to lawfully discharge, and that submission of a Notice of Intent to DEC is required in order to obtain coverage under the General Permit, Riverkeeper does not concede that all of the activities conducted at the Facility are necessarily eligible for coverage under that permit. For example, if the Facility is discharging process wastewater, such as wash water, or has any other polluted non-stormwater discharge that is not authorized by the General Permit, then an individual NPDES permit is required and the failure to obtain

website.²² To register, Pine is required, among other things, to list all stormwater discharges, including descriptions of the industrial activities taking place in the drainage area of each discharge and the acreage of industrial activity exposed to stormwater, the separate storm sewer system or immediate surface water body or wetland to which site runoff discharges, and the name of the watershed and nearest waterbody to which the site ultimately discharges, as well as information about whether the receiving waters are impaired.²³ Pine has failed to prepare and file a Notice of Intent or an application for an individual permit.²⁴

C. Pine is Violating the Clean Water Act by Failing to Comply with the General Permit.

As a discharger of stormwater associated with industrial activity, Pine must comply at all times with the requirements of the General Permit (or an individual permit).²⁵ By discharging stormwater associated with industrial activity without complying with the General Permit, Pine is violating CWA Sections 301(a) and 402(a) and (p).²⁶ The main General Permit requirements that Pine has failed and continues to fail to meet are explained further below.

1. Pine has not developed and implemented a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Before submitting a registration form, Pine must prepare, make available, and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") in accordance with schedules established in the General Permit.²⁷ The SWPPP must identify potential sources of pollution that may affect the quality of stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity. Further, the SWPPP must describe and ensure the implementation of practices that minimize the discharge of pollutants in these discharges and that assure compliance with the other terms and conditions of the General Permit, including achievement of effluent limitations.²⁸

Among other things, the SWPPP must include: a general site description, a general location map identifying the location of the facility and all receiving waters to which stormwater discharges, information related to a company stormwater pollution prevention team, a summary of potential

and comply with an individual NPDES permit for such discharges also violates CWA §§ 301(a) and 402(p). The conditions for eligibility to discharge under the General Permit are provided in Part I.C of the permit.

²² See http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/water_pdf/gpnoi.pdf.

²³ See Division of Water, NY DEC, *Notice of Intent For Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity under the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) Multi-Sector General Permit GP-0-12-001 (MSGP)* (2012), available at http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/water_pdf/gpnoi.pdf.

²⁴ A thorough search of EPA's Enforcement & Compliance History Online ("ECHO") database and DEC's records reveals that no Notice of Intent has been submitted for the Facility.

²⁵ This section discusses the compliance requirements of the General Permit. If Pine elects to seek coverage under an individual NPDES permit instead, the conditions of that individual permit will be at least as strict as those of the General Permit, thus Pine will still be required to comply with all of the following.

²⁶ Sections 301(a) and 402(a) and (p) make it unlawful for Pine to discharge stormwater associated with industrial activity without first complying with all of the conditions established in a NPDES permit.

²⁷ See General Permit Part III.B.

²⁸ See General Permit Part III.A.

pollutant sources, a description of control measures and best management practices, and schedules and procedures for implementation of control measures, monitoring and inspections.²⁹

Pine has not developed and implemented a legally compliant SWPPP, as required by Part III of the General Permit.³⁰

2. Pine has not implemented control measures and Best Management Practices that are selected to meet best available technology standards.

Pine cannot legally discharge stormwater under the General Permit until Pine implements mandatory general and sector-specific control measures called Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) in order to minimize the discharge of pollutants from the Facility.³¹ The selected measures must reduce the discharge of pollution from the Facility to the extent practicable through use of the best available technology for the industry.

The General Permit requires that “[t]he owner or operator must select, design, install, and implement control measures (including best management practices),” in accordance with good engineering practices, to meet the effluent limits contained in the permit.³² The General Permit’s effluent limits include both numeric limits specific to certain sectors³³ and non-numeric technology-based effluent limits that apply to all facilities.³⁴ These non-numeric technology-based restrictions include minimizing the exposure of pollutants to stormwater³⁵ and minimizing the discharge of pollutants in stormwater³⁶ “to the extent achievable using control measures (including best management practices) that are technologically available and economically practicable and achievable in light of best industry practice.”³⁷

Pine has not minimized the discharge of pollution to the extent achievable by implementing control measures or BMPs that are technologically achievable and economically practicable and achievable in light of best industry practice, as required by Parts I.B.1 and VIII of the General Permit.

²⁹ See General Permit Part III.C.

³⁰ Riverkeeper believes no SWPPP exists. If a SWPPP exists, then it is either facially inadequate or has not been fully and adequately implemented.

³¹ See General Permit Part I.B.1, *see also* Part VII (setting forth sector-specific control measures and practices).

³² General Permit Part I.B.1.a. *See also* Part III.C.7 (“The SWPPP must document the location and type of BMPs installed and implemented at the facility to achieve the non-numeric effluent limits in Part I.B.1.a.(2) and where applicable in Part VIII, and the sector specific numeric effluent limitations in Part VIII.”).

³³ See General Permit, Part VIII.

³⁴ See General Permit, Part I.B.1.a.2.

³⁵ See General Permit, Part I.B.1.a.2.a.

³⁶ See General Permit, Part I.B.1.a.2.f.

³⁷ See General Permit, Part I.B.1 (“In the technology-based limits included below and in Part VIII, the term ‘minimize’ means reduce and/or eliminate to the extent achievable using control measures (including best management practices) that are technologically available and economically practicable and achievable in light of best industry practice.”).

3. Pine has not conducted routine site inspections or complied with monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements.

Pine must conduct an annual comprehensive site inspection and evaluation of areas where industrial materials or activities are exposed to precipitation or where spills and leaks have occurred within the past three years.³⁸ The inspection must ensure that all stormwater discharges are adequately controlled and that all BMPs are functioning as expected.³⁹ Records of this inspection must be kept for five years.⁴⁰

In addition, qualified facility personnel must carry out routine inspections at least quarterly.⁴¹ During these inspections, personnel must evaluate conditions and maintenance needs of stormwater management devices, detect leaks and ensure the good condition of containers, evaluate the performance of the existing stormwater BMPs described in the SWPPP, and document any deficiencies in the implementation and/or adequacy of the SWPPP.⁴² Such deficiencies must then be addressed through corrective actions.

The General Permit requires that all covered facilities conduct multiple types of analytical monitoring, and DEC may require additional individualized monitoring as well.⁴³ In particular, all facilities authorized under the General Permit must:

- Collect and analyze stormwater samples for each outfall at least annually;⁴⁴
- Conduct visual monitoring of stormwater discharges at least quarterly;⁴⁵
- Perform an annual dry weather inspection to detect non-stormwater discharges;⁴⁶
- Inspect, sample and monitor discharges from coal pile runoff;⁴⁷
- Inspect, sample and monitor discharges from secondary containment structures and transfer areas;⁴⁸
- Document storm events during which any samples are taken;⁴⁹
- Document all of these monitoring activities;⁵⁰
- keep records of the monitoring with the Facility's SWPPP;⁵¹ and

³⁸ See General Permit, Part IV.A.1.

³⁹ See General Permit, Part IV.A.1.

⁴⁰ See General Permit, Part IV.A.2.

⁴¹ See General Permit, Part III.C.7.b.2.

⁴² See General Permit, Part III.C.7.b.1 and b.3.

⁴³ See General Permit, Part IV.B.3.

⁴⁴ See General Permit, Part IV.B.1.c (requiring at least annual collection and analysis of stormwater samples). See General Permit, Part IV.B.1.d, e, f, and g for obligations to sample more frequently.

⁴⁵ See General Permit, Part IV.B.1.a.

⁴⁶ See General Permit, Part IV.B.1.b.

⁴⁷ See General Permit, Part IV.B.1.d.

⁴⁸ See General Permit, Part IV.B.1.f.

⁴⁹ See General Permit, Part IV.B.2.c.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., General Permit, Parts IV.B.1.a.8, IV.B.1.b.4, IV.B.1.c.9, *see generally* Part IV.E.

⁵¹ See General Permit, Part IV.E.

- submit an annual report to DEC accompanied by a Discharge Monitoring Report detailing the results of all required stormwater samples, as well as reports that document any instance of non-compliance with benchmarks or numeric effluent limitations.⁵²

Because Pine engages in industrial activities associated under Sector N, sampling is required for:

- Total Mercury;
- PCBs;
- Total Suspended Solids;
- Chemical Demand Oxygen;
- Oil and Grease;
- Total Recoverable Aluminum;
- Total Recoverable Cadmium;
- Total Chromium;
- Total Recoverable Copper;
- Total Recoverable Iron;
- Total Recoverable Lead;
- Total Recoverable Zinc.⁵³

If Pine operates a shredder, it must also sample for the following:

- Benzene;
- Ethylbenzene
- Toluene; and
- Xylene⁵⁴

Riverkeeper is not necessarily aware of all industrial activities taking place at the Facility. To the extent that industrial activities other than the above are carried out at the Facility, other sampling may be required as well.⁵⁵ This notice provides Pine with sufficient information to identify the standards and limitations that apply to all categories of industrial activity.

Pine has failed to conduct the required annual and other routine inspections, monitoring, and testing, as required by, at least, Parts III, IV, and VIII of the General Permit. Pine also has failed to retain records and submit monitoring reports to DEC, as required by, at least, Parts IV and VIII of the General Permit.

4. Pine has failed to comply with additional requirements located in Part VIII of the General Permit.

⁵² See General Permit, Part IV.B.1 and 2 and Part IV.C.

⁵³ See General Permit, Part VIII, Sector N.

⁵⁴ See *Id.*

⁵⁵ See General Permit, Part VIII.

As noted above, the General Permit contains various requirements specific to Sector N. These requirements, some of which are referenced above, are collected in Part VIII of the General Permit. They include:

- A requirement that the SWPPP include a program to control materials received for processing:
 - Notifying suppliers/public which scrap materials will not be accepted at the facility or are only accepted under certain conditions;
 - Develop and implement procedures to inspect inbound shipments of recyclable materials;
 - Develop and distribute educational material targeting the public and/or commercial drivers of inbound vehicles; and
 - Training targeted for personnel engaged in the inspection and acceptance of inbound recyclable materials.
- A requirement that the SWPPP address BMPs to minimize contact of particulate matter from materials stored indoors or under cover from coming in contact with surface runoff. The SWPPP shall document considerations of the following BMPs (or their equivalents):
 - Good housekeeping measures, including frequent sweeping of haul and access roads and the use of dry absorbent or wet vacuum clean up methods, to contain or dispose/recycle residual liquids originating from recyclable containers; and
 - Good housekeeping measures to prevent the accumulation of particulate matter and fluids, particularly in high traffic areas.
- A requirement that the SWPPP describe BMPs to minimize contact of stormwater runoff with stockpiled materials, processed materials and non-recyclable wastes. The SWPPP shall document considerations of the following BMPs (or their equivalents):
 - Store the equivalent one day's volume of recyclable materials indoors;
 - Containment of diversion structures such as dikes, berms, culverts, trenches, elevated concrete pads, and grading installed where appropriate to minimize contact of stormwater runoff with outdoor processing equipment or stored materials;
 - Diversion of runoff away from storage areas via dikes, berms, containment trenches, culverts and surface grading;
 - Cover containment bins, dumpsters, roll off boxes;
 - Permanent or semi permanent covers over areas where materials are transferred, stored or stockpiled;
 - Install a sump/pump with each containment pit, and discharge collected fluids to a sanitary sewer system; and
 - Sediment traps, vegetated swales and strips, catch basin filters and sand filters to facilitate settling or filtering of sediments.
- A requirement that the SWPPP address BMPs to minimize contact of residual liquids and particulate matter from materials stored indoors or under cover from coming in contact

with surface runoff. The SWPPP shall document consideration of the following BMPs (or their equivalents):

- Prohibit the practice of allowing washwater from tipping floors or other processing areas from discharging to the storm sewer system;
- Disconnect or seal off all floor drains connected to the storm sewer system;
- Drums containing liquids, especially oil and lubricants, should be stored: indoors; in a bermed area; in overpack containers or spill pallets; or in similar containment devices;
- Drip pans or equivalent measures shall be placed under any leaking piece of stationary equipment until the leak is repaired. The drip pans shall be inspected for leaks and potential overflows and all liquids properly disposed of in accordance with RCRA requirements; and
- Liquid wastes, including used oil, shall be stored in materially compatible and non leaking containers, and be disposed or recycled in accordance with all requirements under the RCRA, and State or local requirements.⁵⁶

Pine's activities are included in the definition of industrial activity to which the CWA applies. Therefore, Pine must obtain coverage under and comply with the requirements of the General Permit, including those specific to Pine's industrial activities, as described in Part VIII and outlined above. Pine has failed to obtain coverage under the General Permit and comply with these additional requirements.

5. Pine is Clearly Violating the Clean Water Act.

In sum, Pine's discharge of stormwater associated with industrial activities without a permit, Pine's failure to apply for permit coverage, and Pine's failure to comply with the above-listed conditions of the General Permit (or an individual NPDES permit) constitute violations of the General Permit and of Sections 301(a) and 402(p) of the Clean Water Act.

III.

PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

Pine Nonferrous, Inc., Pine Scrap Metal, Inc., Pine Export, Inc., Landstar, Inc., and Wah Hom are the persons (as defined by Section 502(5) of the CWA) responsible for the violations alleged in this Notice. Riverkeeper believes that Pine has operated the Facility since at least 2005.⁵⁷ Pine has operational control over the day-to-day industrial activities at this Facility. Therefore, Pine is responsible for managing stormwater at the Facility in compliance with the CWA. Riverkeeper hereby puts Pine on notice that if Riverkeeper subsequently identifies additional

⁵⁶ See General Permit, Part VIII, Sector N.

⁵⁷ Pine Nonferrous incorporated in New York in 1997. Landstar incorporated in New York in 2000, and publicly available property tax records dating back to 2005 connect Landstar to the Facility address.

persons as also being responsible for the violations set forth above, Riverkeeper intends to include those persons in this action.

IV.

LOCATION OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATION

The violations alleged in this Notice have occurred and continue to occur at the Facility located at 34-40 Laurel Hill Boulevard, Queens, New York. For clarity, the Facility location can be uniquely identified as block 2520, lot 22, in Queen County. Stormwater flows from the Facility into a separate sewer system that discharges directly into Newtown Creek. The failure to develop and implement pollution prevention plans and take the other required measures are violations occurring at the Facility in general and in the inadequate documents themselves.⁵⁸

V.

DATES OF VIOLATION

Every day upon which Pine has failed to apply for permit coverage since Pine first commenced operations at the Facility and discharged polluted stormwater is a separate violation of Sections 301(a) of the CWA and EPA's regulations implementing the CWA.⁵⁹ These days of violation have continued consecutively since 2005 when Riverkeeper believes Pine commenced operation at the Facility.

Additionally, Pine has discharged without a permit in violation of Section 301(a) of the CWA every day since Pine commenced operations at the Facility on which there has been a measurable precipitation event or discharge of previously accumulated precipitation (i.e., snowmelt) over 0.1 inches.

Finally, if Pine seeks permit coverage after receiving this letter but fails to fully comply with the requirements of the General Permit (or an individual permit), each day upon which Pine claims coverage under a NPDES permit but fails to comply with that permit will constitute a separate day of violation with respect to each unmet condition of that permit.

⁵⁸ The federal courts have held that a reasonably specific indication of the area where violations occurred, such as the name of the facility, is sufficient and that more precise locations need not be included in the notice. *See, e.g., Natural Resources Defense Council v. Southwest Marine, Inc.*, 945 F. Supp. 1330, 1333 (S.D. Cal. 1996), *aff'd* 236 F.3d 985, 996 (9th Cir. 2000); *City of New York v. Anglebrook Ltd. Partnership*, 891 F. Supp. 900, 908 (S.D.N.Y. 1995); *Assateague Coastkeeper v. Alan & Kristin Hudson Farm*, 727 F. Supp. 2d 433, 439 (D. Md. 2010); *United Anglers v. Kaiser Sand & Gravel Co.*, No. C 95-2066 CW, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22449 at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 1995).

⁵⁹ *See* 33 U.S.C. §§ 402(p)(3)(A) and (p)(4)(A) (requiring the establishment of industrial stormwater NPDES permits and of a permit application process).

Pine is liable for the above-described violations occurring prior to the date of this letter and for every day after the date of this letter that these violations continue. In addition to the violations set forth above, this Notice covers all violations of the CWA evidenced by information that becomes available after the date of this Notice of Intent to File Suit.⁶⁰ These violations are ongoing, and barring full compliance with the permitting requirements of the Clean Water Act, these violations will continue.

VI.

RELIEF REQUESTED

Riverkeeper will ask the court to order Pine to comply with the Clean Water Act, to pay penalties, and to pay Riverkeeper's costs and legal fees.

First, Riverkeeper will seek declaratory relief and injunctive relief to prevent further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), and such other relief as permitted by law. Riverkeeper will seek an order from the Court requiring Pine to obtain NPDES permit coverage and to correct all other identified violations through direct implementation of control measures and demonstration of full regulatory compliance.

Second, pursuant to Section 309(d) of the CWA,⁶¹ each separate violation of the CWA subjects Pine to a penalty not to exceed \$37,500 per day for each violation that occurred. Riverkeeper will seek the full penalties allowed by law.

Third and lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the CWA, Riverkeeper will seek recovery of litigation fees and costs (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) associated with this matter.

VII.

PERSONS GIVING NOTICE

The full name, address, and telephone number of the persons giving notice are as follows:

Riverkeeper, Inc.
20 Secor Road

⁶⁰ See, e.g. *Public Interest Research Grp. v. Hercules, Inc.*, 50 F.3d 1239, 1248-49 (3d Cir.1995) (a notice that adequately identifies specific violations to a potential defendant also covers repeated and related violations that the plaintiff learns of later. "For example, if a permit holder has discharged pollutant 'x' in excess of the permitted effluent limit five times in a month but the citizen has learned only of four violations, the citizen will give notice of the four violations of which the citizen then has knowledge but should be able to include the fifth violation in the suit when it is discovered.").

⁶¹ 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d); see also 40 C.F.R. § 19.4 (Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation).

Ossining, NY 10562
(914) 478-4501
Attn.: John Parker

VIII.

IDENTIFICATION OF COUNSEL

Riverkeeper is represented by legal counsel in this matter. The name, address, and telephone number of Riverkeeper's attorneys are:

Edan Rotenberg
Nicholas Tapert
Super Law Group, LLC
180 Maiden Lane, Suite 603
New York, New York 10038
(212) 242-2355

IX.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing provides more than sufficient information to permit Pine to identify the specific standard, limitation, or order alleged to have been violated, the activity alleged to constitute a violation, the person or persons responsible for the alleged violation, the location of the alleged violation, the date or dates of such violation, and the full name, address, and telephone number of the person giving notice.⁶²

If Pine has developed a SWPPP, Riverkeeper requests that Pine send a copy to the undersigned attorney.⁶³ Otherwise, Riverkeeper encourages Pine to begin developing a SWPPP immediately after receiving this letter and asks that Pine please inform the undersigned attorney of Pine's efforts so Riverkeeper can work with Pine to avoid disputes over the contents of the SWPPP.⁶⁴

⁶² 40 C.F.R. § 135.3(a).

⁶³ Note that under Part III.D.2 of the General Permit, the owner or operator of a facility "must make a copy of the SWPPP available to the public within 14 days of receipt of a written request."

⁶⁴ Riverkeeper will not send a new notice letter in response to any effort Pine makes to come into compliance with the Clean Water Act after receiving this letter, for example, by developing a SWPPP. The federal courts have held that citizens sending a notice letter are not required to identify inadequacies in compliance documents that do not yet exist and are "not required to send a second notice letter in order to pursue specific claims regarding the inadequacies of [a defendant's] post-notice compliance efforts." *WaterKeepers N. Cal. v. AG Indus. Mfg.*, 375 F.3d 913, 920 (9th Cir. 2004). See also *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Southwest Marine, Inc.*, 236 F.3d 985, 997 (9th Cir. 2000) ("subject matter jurisdiction is established by providing a notice that is adequate on the date it is given to the defendant. The defendant's later changes . . . do not retroactively divest a district court of jurisdiction

During the sixty-day notice period, Riverkeeper is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations noted in this letter that may avoid protracted litigation. If Pine wishes to pursue such discussions, please contact the undersigned attorney immediately so that negotiations may be completed before the end of the sixty-day notice period. We do not intend to delay the filing of a complaint in federal court, regardless of whether discussions are continuing at the conclusion of the sixty days.

Very truly yours,



Edan Rotenberg
Nicholas Tapert
Super Law Group, LLC
180 Maiden Lane, Suite 603
New York, New York 10038
(212) 242-2355

cc:

Gina McCarthy, Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Judith A. Enck, EPA Region 2 Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

Basil Seggos, Acting Commissioner
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-1011

William E. Howell, Jr., Esq.
(registered agent for Landstar, Inc.)
3210 N. Monroe Street
Wilmington, DE 19802

William E. Howell, Jr., Esq.

under 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b)."); *City of New York v. Anglebrook L.P.*, 891 F. Supp. 900, 908 (S.D.N.Y. 1995) (plaintiff's notice letter based on inadequacies of defendant's original SWPPP held sufficient to establish court's jurisdiction, even though defendant later prepared a revised SWPPP).

Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit
May 11, 2016
Page 16 of 16

(registered agent for Landstar, Inc.)
110 E. State Street
Kennett Square, PA 19348